Serial No. 10/051,807 Amendment dated July 13, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2004

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 30, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

In view of the foregoing amendments, and following representations, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Examiner Shakeri is thanked for the courtesies extended undersigned counsel during the personal interview of July 7, 2004.

During that personal interview, Applicant's counsel showed Examiner Shakeri the attached proposed drawing change to Fig. 2. Examiner Shakeri indicated the change would overcome the objection to the drawings in the March 30, 2004 Office Action.

Applicant's counsel likewise argued that none of the prior art of record, whether considered singly or in combination, would have taught or fairly suggested Applicant's inventive blasting device having both two(2) blasting and recovery tanks, switchable between each other, and a clear portion on an extension of a blasting gun that was sufficiently clear so that the person using the blasting qun could see what he or she was blasting.

Examiner Shakeri agreed, as indicated in the written Interview Summary dated July 7, 2004, that an amended independent claim including the features of claims 1, 4, 5, and 6 would appear to be allowable over all of the prior art of record.

In a later telephone interview of July 7, 2004, Examiner

Serial No. 10/051,807 Amendment dated July 13, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2004

Shakeri indicated that the limitation that the claimed sufficiently clear portion of the extension of the blasting gun need not be limited to "plastic" in an allowable independent claim; rather, the particular feature of the substantially clear portion being plastic could be set forth in a dependent claim.

Applicant has done all the above agreed-on changes with the above Amendment.

As to the March 30, 2004 Office Action, please note the following.

To overcome the objection to the drawing, Applicant has shown a block diagram switching valve 68 for the two tanks. A proposed drawing change to Fig. 2 has been included in this amendment, along with a sheet of formal drawings incorporating the change to Fig. 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that this block diagram switching valve is identical to the block diagram switching valve, presented at the July 7, 2004 personal interview, and is in accordance with Examiner Shakeri's "general block diagram" suggested in part 1 on page 2 of the March 30, 2004 Office Action.

To overcome the various rejection of the claims, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to include Applicant's novel and unobvious features.

The amendment to Fig. 2, was done for ease of readability and understanding, even though such features would have been readily apparent to a person having ordinary skill in the art, based on the written description and claims as filed, would not have required

Serial No. 10/051,807 Amendment dated July 13, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2004

undo experimentation, and likewise would not have risen to the level of amendments touching patentability as envisioned by the <u>Festo</u> Court.

In sum, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance with claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, and 14-17.

Claims 1 and 11 are in independent form.

Attached is a check in the amount of \$55.00 for a one-month extension of time (small entity).

It is believed that no additional fee is due for this submission. Should that determination be incorrect; however, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 19-2105, and notify the undersigned in due course.

Should any outstanding formal matters or other issues remain, Examiner Shakeri is requested to telephone Terrence Brown at (703) 684-5600 to resolve such.

Date.

1 anne 18

Terrence L.B. Brown Attorney for Applicant

Req. No. 32,685

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP 3000 South Eads Street Arlington, Virginia 22202 (703) 684-5600 sb